

DOCKET NO: 254781US0PCT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :  
CARL SIDONIUS, MARIA ANDELA, ET : EXAMINER: R.B. MONDESI  
AL.  
SERIAL NO: 10/500,967 :  
FILED: JULY 8, 2004 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1652  
FOR: GRANULATES CONTAINING FEED-ENZYMES

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

Responsive to the Office Action dated October 3, 2007, Applicants respectfully  
request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks:

**Remarks** begin on page 2 of this paper.

REMARKS

Claims 33-55 are pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Mondesi for the helpful and courteous discussion held with their representative on April 17, 2002. During the discussion, Applicants pointed out that the cited references fail to disclose a granulate comprising granules which comprise an enzyme coated with a polyolefin. The following remarks expand on the discussion with the Examiner.

The present invention relates to a granulate comprising granules which comprise an enzyme coated with a polyolefin. See Claim 33.

The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Dale et al. is respectfully traversed. The reference fails to disclose the claimed granulate.

Dale et al. disclose a granular enzyme composition. See the Abstract. However, the enzyme is not coated by a polyolefin in Dale et al. That reference describes polymer coatings in the Abstract, column 2, lines 30-37; and columns 3, 4 and 7: PVA, PVP, PEG. None of those polymers is a polyolefin.

In view of the foregoing, Dale et al. fail to disclose the claimed granulate. Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over De Lima et al. is respectfully traversed. The reference fails to disclose the claimed granulate.

De Lima et al. disclose enzyme-containing granules. See the Abstract.

The granules may be coated, as described at column 11, with polyethylene glycol (PEG). PEG is not a polyolefin. In fact, nowhere does De Lima et al. describe a granulate comprising granules which comprise an enzyme coated with a polyolefin.

In view of the foregoing, De Lima et al. fail to disclose the claimed granulate. Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.


The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dale et al. in view of Masschelein et al. is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Dale et al. fail to disclose the claimed granulate. Masschelein et al. relates to a fabric treatment composition. Therefore, those references taken in combination fail to suggest a granulate comprising granules which comprise an enzyme coated with a polyolefin. Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
James J. Kelly, Ph.D.  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 41,504

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

**James H. Knebel**  
**Registration No. 22,630**